

1 Vladimir Belo (State Bar No. 192217)  
 vbelo@bricker.com  
 2 Bricker & Eckler  
 100 South Third Street  
 3 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291  
 Telephone: 614-227-2300  
 4 Facsimile: 614-226-8812

5 Jeffrey Wertheimer (State Bar No. 120378)  
 jwertheimer@rutan.com  
 6 Summer Young Agriesti (State Bar No. 232883)  
 syoung@rutan.com  
 7 RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP  
 611 Anton Boulevard, Fourteenth Floor  
 8 Costa Mesa, California 92626-1931  
 Telephone: 714-641-5100  
 9 Facsimile: 714-546-9035

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant  
 EXCEPTIONAL INNOVATION, LLC

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 13 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

14 EXCEPTIONAL INNOVATION, LLC,  
 15 Plaintiff,  
 16 vs.  
 17 KONTRON AMERICA, INC.,  
 18 Defendant.

Case No. 3:07-CV-02041-LAB-LSP

**EXCEPTIONAL INNOVATION, LLC'S  
 ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED  
 COUNTERCLAIM OF DEFENDANT  
 AND CROSS-COMPLAINANT  
 KONTRON AMERICA, INC.**

19 AND RELATED CROSS-ACTIONS.  
 20

21 Plaintiff Exceptional Innovation, LLC ("Exceptional Innovation"), by and through  
 22 counsel, hereby responds to Defendant Kontron America, Inc.'s ("Kontron") First  
 23 Amended Counterclaim ("FACC") against it, and states the following:

24 1. Exceptional Innovation incorporates by reference the allegations and  
 25 averments in its Complaint against Kontron as if fully set forth herein and further responds  
 26 to Kontron's FACC as follows:

27 2. Exceptional Innovation lacks sufficient knowledge or information to form a  
 28 belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained on Paragraph 2 of the FACC and

1 therefore denies such allegations.

2       3.       Exceptional Innovation admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of  
3 the FACC.

4       4.       Exceptional Innovation admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of  
5 the FACC.

6       5.       In response to Paragraph 5 of the FACC, Exceptional Innovation states that  
7 the Sales Quotes and Terms and Conditions are written documents that speak for  
8 themselves. Further responding, Exceptional Innovation denies that the “Agreement”  
9 consists of the Sales Quotes and Terms and Conditions and denies all remaining  
10 allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of the FACC.

11       6.       Paragraph 6 of the FACC contains legal conclusions to which no response is  
12 required. To the extent a response is required, Exceptional Innovation denies the  
13 allegations contained in Paragraph 6 of the FACC.

14       7.       Exceptional Innovation admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of  
15 the FACC, except that, to the extent “expressed an interest” is intended to indicate that  
16 Exceptional Innovation sought out Kontron, such allegation is denied.

17       8.       Exceptional Innovation admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of  
18 the FACC.

19       9.       Exceptional Innovation admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of  
20 the FACC.

21       10.      Exceptional Innovation admits that Kontron issued the two sales quotes  
22 attached as Exhibit 1 on or about May 12, 2005, and denies the remaining allegations  
23 contained in Paragraph 10 of the FACC.

24       11.      In response to Paragraph 11 of the FACC, Exceptional Innovation states that  
25 the Sales Quotes are written documents that speak for themselves. Further responding,  
26 Exceptional Innovation denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of the  
27 FACC.

28       12.      Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of

1 the FACC.

2 13. Exceptional Innovation admits that it issued two Purchase Requests and that  
3 true and accurate copies of these requests are attached to Kontron's Answer and FACC as  
4 Exhibit 2 and were also attached to Exceptional Innovation's Complaint. Exceptional  
5 Innovation denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 13 of the FACC.

6 14. In response to Paragraph 14 of the FACC, Exceptional Innovation states that  
7 the documents comprising the agreement are written documents that speak for themselves.  
8 Further responding, Exceptional Innovation denies the remaining allegations contained in  
9 Paragraph 14 of the FACC.

10 15. Exceptional Innovation admits that it received a reduction in the price it was  
11 originally to pay for Kontron's products. Exceptional Innovation also admits that Kontron  
12 issued the Sales Quote that is attached as Exhibit 1. Exhibit 1 is a written document that  
13 speaks for itself. Further responding, Exceptional Innovation denies any remaining  
14 allegations contained in Paragraph 15 of the FACC.

15 16. Exceptional Innovation admits that Kontron invoiced a reduced sum to  
16 Exceptional Innovation. Exceptional Innovation denies the remaining allegations  
17 contained in Paragraph 16 of the FACC.

18 17. Exceptional Innovation admits that Kontron eventually delivered products to  
19 it. Further responding, to the extent such is alleged, Exceptional Innovation denies that  
20 Kontron delivered conforming goods and that the delivery was timely. Exceptional  
21 Innovation denies any remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of the FACC.

22 18. Exceptional Innovation admits that Kontron sent it the three invoices that are  
23 attached to the Answer and FACC as Exhibit 3. Exceptional Innovation denies any  
24 remaining allegations in Paragraph 18 of the FACC.

25 19. For its response to Paragraph 19 of the FACC, Exceptional Innovation states  
26 that the invoices attached as Exhibit 3 are written documents that speak for themselves.  
27 Further responding, Exceptional Innovation denies the remaining allegations contained in  
28 Paragraph 19 of the FACC.

1           20. For its response to Paragraph 20 of the FACC, Exceptional Innovation states  
2 that the invoices attached as Exhibit 3 are written documents that speak for themselves.  
3 Further responding, Exceptional Innovation denies the remaining allegations contained in  
4 Paragraph 20 of the FACC.

5           21. For its response to Paragraph 21 of the FACC, Exceptional Innovation states  
6 that the invoices attached as Exhibit 3 are written documents that speak for themselves.  
7 Exceptional Innovation denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 21 of the  
8 FACC.

9           22. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 22 of  
10 the FACC.

11           23. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 23 of  
12 the FACC.

13           24. Exceptional Innovation incorporates its responses and averments in each of  
14 the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

15           25. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of  
16 the FACC.

17           26. Exceptional Innovation admits only that Kontron issued invoices and  
18 delivered goods to it, but denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 26 of the  
19 FACC.

20           27. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 27 of  
21 the FACC.

22           28. Exceptional Innovation admits that Kontron has demanded additional  
23 payment from it, but denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 28 of the  
24 FACC.

25           29. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 29 of  
26 the FACC.

27           30. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 30 of  
28 the FACC. By way of further response, Exceptional Innovation denies that it is liable to

1 Kontron in the sum demanded, or in any sum.

2 31. Exceptional Innovation incorporates its responses and averments in each of  
3 the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

4 32. For its response to Paragraph 32 of the FACC, Exceptional Innovation states  
5 that the documents comprising the agreement are written documents that speak for  
6 themselves. Further responding, Exceptional Innovation denies the remaining allegations  
7 contained in Paragraph 32 of the FACC.

8 33. Exceptional Innovation admits only that it initiated a lawsuit in Delaware  
9 County Common Pleas Court on June 27, 2007 and denies the remaining allegations  
10 contained in Paragraph 33 of the FACC.

11 34. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 34 of  
12 the FACC.

13 35. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 35 of  
14 the FACC. By way of further response, Exceptional Innovation denies that it is liable to  
15 Kontron in any sum.

16 36. Exceptional Innovation incorporates its responses and averments in each of  
17 the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

18 37. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 37 of  
19 the FACC.

20 38. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 38 of  
21 the FACC.

22 39. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 39 of  
23 the FACC.

24 40. Paragraph 40 of the FACC contains legal conclusions to which no response  
25 is required. To the extent a response is required, Exceptional Innovation denies the  
26 allegations contained in Paragraph 40 of the FACC. By way of further response,  
27 Exceptional Innovation denies that it is liable to Kontron in any sum.

28 41. Exceptional Innovation incorporates its responses and averments in each of

1 the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

2 42. Exceptional Innovation admits only that it purchased goods from Kontron,  
3 that Kontron delivered some goods to it, and that some of the deliveries were within the  
4 last two years. Exceptional Innovation denies the remaining allegations contained in  
5 Paragraph 42 of the FACC.

6 43. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 43 of  
7 the FACC.

8 44. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 44 of  
9 the FACC. By way of further response, Exceptional Innovation denies that it is liable to  
10 Kontron in the sum demanded, or in any sum.

11 45. Exceptional Innovation incorporates its responses and averments in each of  
12 the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

13 46. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 46 of  
14 the FACC.

15 47. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 47 of  
16 the FACC. By way of further response, Exceptional Innovation denies that it is liable to  
17 Kontron in the sum demanded, or in any sum.

18 48. Exceptional Innovation incorporates its responses and averments in each of  
19 the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

20 49. Exceptional Innovation admits only that it received some goods from  
21 Kontron, but denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 49 of the FACC.

22 50. Exceptional Innovation denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 50 of  
23 the FACC.

24 51. Paragraph 51 of the FACC contains legal conclusions to which no response  
25 is required. To the extent a response is required, Exceptional Innovation denies the  
26 allegations contained in Paragraph 51 of the FACC.

27 52. Paragraph 52 of the FACC contains legal conclusions to which no response  
28 is required. To the extent a response is required, Exceptional Innovation denies the

1 allegations contained in Paragraph 52 of the FACC. By way of further response,  
2 Exceptional Innovation denies that it is liable to Kontron in the sum demanded, or in any  
3 sum.

4 53. Exceptional Innovation denies any and all allegations contained in Kontron's  
5 FACC that are not specifically admitted herein.

6 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

7 54. Kontron's FACC fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted.

8 55. To the extent Kontron's claims rely upon California law and this Court finds  
9 California law inapplicable, such counts fail to state a claim on which relief can be  
10 granted.

11 56. To the extent the agreement is governed by statute, Kontron's claims relying  
12 upon common law fail to state a claim in which relief can be granted.

13 57. Exceptional Innovation is excused from further performance under the  
14 agreement, including payment of any additional sums, due to Kontron's prior material  
15 breaches.

16 58. Kontron's recovery is precluded in whole or in part by the doctrine of  
17 unclean hands.

18 59. Kontron's recovery is precluded in whole or in part because the purpose of  
19 the contract was frustrated.

20 60. Kontron's recovery is precluded in whole or in part to the extent that  
21 Exceptional Innovation is entitled to an offset or deduction, based on its own damages.

22 61. Kontron's recovery is precluded in whole or in part by the applicable statutes  
23 of limitations.

24 62. Kontron's recovery is precluded in whole or in part by Kontron's failure to  
25 perform.

26 63. Kontron's recovery is precluded in whole or in part by the doctrines of  
27 waiver and/or estoppel.

28 64. Kontron's recovery is precluded in whole or in part by the doctrine of laches.





**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is Rutan & Tucker, LLP, 611 Anton Boulevard, Fourteenth Floor, Costa Mesa, California 92626-1931.

On April 17, 2008, I served the following described as:

**EXCEPTIONAL INNOVATION, LLC'S ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED  
COUNTERCLAIM OF DEFENDANT AND  
CROSS-COMPLAINANT KONTRON AMERICA, INC.**

on all parties identified for Notice Of Electronic Filing generated by the Court's CM/ECF system in this case on this date in the following manner:

Elizabeth A. Mitchell, Esq.  
Solomon Ward Seidenwurm & Smith, LLP  
Wells Fargo Plaza  
401 B Street  
Suite 1200  
San Diego, California 92101  
Tel: (619) 238-4828  
Fax: (619) 615-7928  
*Attorneys for Defendant and Counter Claimant  
KONTRON AMERICA, INC.*

Vladimir P. Belo, Esq.  
Bricker & Eckler LLP  
100 South Third Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4291  
Tel: (614) 227-8885  
Fax: (614) 227-2390  
*Co-Counsel for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant  
EXCEPTIONAL INNOVATION, LLC*

☒ **(BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE)** by causing the document to be served via the Court's ECF Filing System.

☒ **(FEDERAL)** I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

EXECUTED on April 17, 2008, at Costa Mesa, California.

Michelle Perciavalle  
(Type or print name)

/s/  
(Signature)